

CAREER LADDER AND TIERED LICENSURE COMMITTEE**MAY 13, 2014****MEETING NOTES**

Present: Rod Lewis, Chair; Linda Clark, Co-Chair, Senator John Goedde; Senator Janie Ward-Engelking; Representative Marc Gibbs, Representative Lance Clow; Representative Wendy Horman; Superintendent Tom Luna; Wayne Freedman, Brian Smith, Penni Cyr, Rob Winslow; Christina Linder; Geoffrey Thomas (via phone)

Not Present: Paula Conley, Rod Gramer

Others Present: Taylor Raney and Jason Hancock, State Department of Education; Tracie Bent and Marilyn Whitney, State Board of Education

Tracie L. Bent, Chief Policy and Planning Officer, State Board of Education (SBOE), explained that Idaho Code (Code) authorizes SBOE to make changes to administrative rule (rule/s). Requirements for educator licensure also are found in rule. Rules are much more detailed than Code and carry more flexibility for amendment or changes than the legislative process of revising code. Funding the Career Ladder, however, does require the legislative process since it involves appropriations.

Ms. Bent advised that this committee will need to prepare an initial Statement of Purpose and Fiscal Note for the Career Ladder for the June 2014 OSBE Board Meeting. Final language needs to be completed for the October OSBE board meeting. For tiered licensure, the committee needs to create rules by August 1st, which then begins a process for public hearing and comment. The final rules will be presented to the education committees of the legislature at the opening of the 2015 Legislative Session.

Senator Goedde, Representatives Gibbs, Clow and Horman, and Superintendent Luna discussed the process of presenting tiered licensure in administrative rules, and career ladder (with mention of tiers) in legislation. They all agreed that both needed to be presented as a parallel package in order for the legislature to feel comfortable with both the increase in teacher pay, but also in higher standards for teachers.

Linda Clark added that the Task Force Recommendations for mentoring and professional development would be placed in legislation. Mentoring is already in Code, but it needs appropriation to reinstitute the state-wide mentoring plan.

Given the timeframes discussed above, the committee chose the following dates for their next meetings: May 27, June 11, June 25, July 14, and July 29.

Superintendent Luna introduced Taylor Raney, Director of Certification, State Department of Education (SDE) to detail the SDE's Technical Advisory Committee's (TAC) work on Tier 1 and Tier 2 of the proposed new licensure structure. Superintendent Luna explained that the TAC could not address every area of question, and anticipated that additions and corrections may need to be made over the period of implementation.

The purpose of tiered licensure, Mr. Raney explained, is threefold:

- To attract and retain great teachers;

- To Identify struggling teachers and to intervene in order to do what is best for students; the SDE looks at this aspect as the exception, not the rule; and
- To elevate the profession, not just pay more to teachers.

Mr. Raney described the current system before initial certification, and described how the proposed changes will only add to current standards for initial certification.

Current Requirements for Certification	Proposed Requirements for Initial Certification
Minimum credit requirement	Minimum credit requirement
Successful score on Praxis II	Successful score on Praxis II
	"Basic" score on all 22 points of the Danielson Framework ¹
Institution recommends a candidate for Standard Certification.	Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP) developed in concert with supervising instructor
	Measureable student achievement during student teaching.
	Institution recommends a candidate for non-renewable initial certification.

Superintendent Luna explained that in moving to the proposed new standards, no SBOE, laws or statutes would need to be changed.

Rod Lewis asked if it were possible to demonstrate student achievement in a student teaching setting. Mr. Raney replied that a student teacher has time to set appropriate goals, to evaluate their students, and to obtain support from their supervising teachers. Brian Smith questioned some elements of the Danielson components and questioned whether they could be observed, such as parent contact. Christina Linder replied that in aligning all teacher curricula to the Danielson, pre-service teachers receive training and gain an observable knowledge of both teaching and community outreach. The "basic" standard is a low bar, and may need to include a caveat that the student teacher did not participate in an actual parent conference.

Linda Clark questioned the usefulness of the Danielson model, suggesting that it was significantly outdated for 21st century classrooms. She said that it is a direct teaching model, whereas the 21st century model envisions that a skilled practitioner will use tools to engage learning, and work in collaboration with other teachers, just as the Common Core encourages in student work. Both Christina Linder and Superintendent Luna explained that the evaluator would be looking for appropriate use of technology and adaptation to change. Ms. Clark replied that she hoped the model and the universities would be as fluid as practicing teachers.

Senator Goedde inquired about the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation's (NTEP) work. Christina Linder said that NTEP is grounded in the Danielson framework, and looks for

¹ The Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility.

accountability in researched-based measures. She felt it was the best foundation available at this time.

In continued discussion of the Danielson components, the group discussed their appropriateness in student teaching. For example, Danielson requires community involvement, yet student teachers are often discouraged from doing so. Similarly, some supervising teachers do not want the student teacher to contact parents, since they are ultimately held accountable for the students. Student achievement could also affect the supervising teacher's license.

Christina Linder explained that the universities had been working on this for some time, and while recognizing some difficulties, all felt it was attainable. "What gets measured gets done." Superintendent Luna added that these recommendations were a product of the colleges of education, and they were comfortable that they could measure pre-service teachers on the Danielson framework. Superintendent Luna also said that whereas not all administrators have gone through Danielson training at this time, that requirement would be put into rule. Christina Linder also reminded the committee that the universities have adopted these standards as their practice and were in the pilot phase now with the intention toward full implementation next year.

Tracie Bent said that the universities are raising the bar for teacher certification, and this committee could add to administrative rule the elements which an institutional recommendation must contain. Similarly, as the committee looks at Tier 1, the elements of an institutional recommendation, consistent with the universities, can be included in rule.

Taylor Raney next described the recommendations for a teacher moving from initial certification (Tier 1) to Professional Certification (Tier 2). Currently, no distinction exists. A student graduates from a teacher preparation program, receives an institutional recommendation, and obtains a license.

To move from Tier 1 to Tier 2, the SDE TAC recommends:

- Proficiency (3) on all 22 components of the Danielson Framework for two consecutive years;
- An IPLP to address student achievement;
- Measureable student achievement; and
- District recommendation.

Mr. Raney distributed a proposed form B99. He acknowledged that a mentoring component was needed.

Mr. Raney envisioned that a Tier 1 initial licensed teacher would progress as follows:

Year 1 Mentoring Evaluation on student achievement IPLP	Year 2 Same as Year 1	Year 3 Same, without required mentoring
END OF YEAR 3 Did they receive proficiency on all 22 Danielson components in Years 2-3 and work towards professional personal growth?	If Yes – Professional (Tier 2) License	If No, stay on Tier 1 for Year 4
END OF YEAR 4 Did they receive proficiency on all 22 Danielson components in Years 2-3 and work towards professional personal growth?	If Yes – Professional (Tier 2) License	If No, stay on Tier 1 for Year 5 with intensive mentoring, an IPLP and measurement in student achievement
END OF YEAR 5 Did they receive proficiency on all 22 Danielson components in Years 2-3 and work towards professional personal growth?	If Yes – Professional (Tier 2) License	If No, stay on Tier 1 for Year 6 with optional mentoring, an IPLP and measurement in student achievement
END OF YEAR 6 Did they receive proficiency on all 22 Danielson components in Years 2-3 and work towards professional personal growth?	If Yes – Professional (Tier 2) License	If No, no longer certified. The Task Force recommended that a candidate had six years, but no more, to receive a Professional License.

A teacher receiving a rating of unsatisfactory on any of the components in years 3-6 would not be eligible for subsequent licensure. TAC felt that an unsatisfactory meant that the candidate was regressing, since s/he needed a “basic” for initial licensure.

If a teacher has scored proficient in all 22 components and then changes assignment, he must be proficient in Tier 1 for two years, but not necessarily consecutively, including the last year.

The Professional Standards Commission (PSC) would review 10 percent of district Tier 2 applicants annually to ensure that proper accountability standards were being met.

Rod Lewis asked if the State wanted to wait six years before ending a candidate’s license. Superintendent Luna reminded the committee that the proposals were a path to Professional licensure, but separate from a contract for employment. A district had no obligation to renew a contract for a new teacher who was not doing well. At the end of three years, a contract might be renewed, but one year at a time.

Brian Smith voiced concern about proficiency in all 22 areas of the Danielson framework in 3 years when Charlotte Danielson herself expects 5 years for proficiency. Superintendent Luna replied that this topic had been discussed extensively at the TAC. While a provision is available to move to Professional (Tier 2) licensure after three years, TAC anticipates that most teachers would need 4-5 years to reach proficiency. Mr. Smith also questioned the “inflation evaluation” whereby an

evaluator might want to award only a “basic,” but realizes that a teacher could be denied licensure, and so falsely awards a proficiency rating.

Representative Gibbs voiced the concern about creating a system that opens a district to litigation if it wants to terminate a teacher after three years. He agreed with a probation plan, but not loss of licensure.

Rob Winslow asked when the “clock” for licensure starts – when a candidate obtains a license or starts work. Christina Linder replied that Year 1 begins with a contract year.

Penni Cyr offered as an example a 20 year teacher who had always received good evaluations; then the principal retired, and a new principal gave that teacher unsatisfactory marks. Ms. Cyr voiced concern that the marks are vague and open to interpretation. Linda Clark said that in dealing with reduction in force (RIF) decisions, she required that every certified person had two evaluators; she believes safeguards can be put in place with peer review.

Representative Ward-Engelking said that in the first three years, a teacher is an at will employee, so a teacher could lose her job at the end of a year for unsatisfactory work. But with any other profession, a person would need to do something egregious to lose his/her license. She cautioned about pulling a license unless it was for very egregious behavior. Senator Goedde suggested that peer review might be the backstop for loss of license.

Representative Clow also cautioned against loss of license. He suggested that the principal in Ms. Cyr’s example may also have been underperforming and was retaining a teacher who was underperforming.

Brian Smith restated his concern that all 22 Danielson components needed to be proficient; no room existed for a basic rating. Linda Clark suggested that perhaps some areas in the Danielson did not merit a 1-5 rating, but simply a yes or no. Representative Horman suggested that some areas may not have any relationship to student achievement.

Linda Clark voiced her concern about poor teachers moving on to other districts, since not all districts ask for the personnel file. She said that when her district is close to releasing someone, the person will often resign rather than be dismissed.

Tom Luna reminded the committee that the State gives licenses with a specific timeframe to different individuals or entities that wish to contract with the State. They must apply and meet the requirements. In education, Idaho has a high bar for losing a license – egregious behavior – and a low bar for meeting professional development requirements, with nothing in between. The directive from the Task Force was clear that Idaho needs to raise the bar in order to move to tiered licensure.

Rod Lewis said that in essence, Tier 1 requires that a person achieve Tier 2, and an effective teacher should be able to achieve Tier 2 by year 5 or 6. He does not want to create a system that perpetuates struggling teachers.

Linda Clark asked Ms. Linder how other states were grappling with these issues. Ms. Linder replied that some states do end licensure at the end of an initial period. Some states offer a second chance

via another preparatory institution, such as a master's degree, but not with a license. Many states are changing their practice and requiring a stronger gateway to Tier 2.

The committee again discussed whether or not all 22 components of the Danielson framework were appropriate for a 1-5 rating. Superintendent Luna suggested that the TAC review them in that light. He told the committee that TAC had discussed requiring proficiency two years in a row, and also proficiency averages, but when they read the definitions carefully, they did not feel that "basic" was acceptable for a Tier 2 teacher. Senator Goedde added that, in asking for \$250M for teachers, "the more we water it down, the less chance we have to get it passed." Representative Gibbs agreed that the legislature will want something significant to enhance licensure: professional, results-based education standards.

Brian Smith asked about an appeals process. Linda Clark agreed that an appeals process was appropriate at the licensure level, not the district level. Senator Ward-Engelking said that six years is probably reasonable and that it does take five years to become a dynamic teacher, although perhaps some might accomplish it in three or four. Superintendent Luna said that a five year average time to reach proficiency, with the ability to accomplish proficient sooner, was the driving force behind the recommendation. Christina Linder added that the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project had concluded that 2-3 years would allow time for new in service teachers to reach proficiency. Wayne Freedman said that if the districts do their job in assisting new teachers, then their success rate will improve.

Mr. Raney said that in an appeals process, TAC feels that the burden would be on the district – it would be a joint effort to bring the appeal to the Professional Standards Commission (PSC). The PSC would have a hard time trumping the principal. Superintendent Luna explained that the TAC had anticipated that when the level and credibility of evaluations were raised, then there would be an appeals process for the teacher to the district to the local board and to SBOE. Tracie Bent said that all administrative rules can be appealed to the State Board. Linda Clark said that unless a teacher's actions were egregious, no one loses a job without an improvement plan and probation put in place by the supervising principal and the administrative district. A teacher is not allowed to appeal individual markings on an evaluation to the State.

Penni Cyr said that if she, as a teacher, were to lose her license, she should have a place to go consisting of her peers to look at the evidence brought against her. Christina Linder added the PSC can extend an interim certificate. Senator Goedde agreed that the process was two steps: first, appeal to the district board level, then appeal to the PSC.

Taylor Raney will prepare a presentation on a two-step appeals process.

Mr. Raney described TAC's thoughts concerning maintenance of a Tier 2 license. Currently teachers are required to complete additional credits to maintain their professional license. New proposals include the addition of an Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP) with a goal of increasing student achievement. Still to be determined are student achievement measures and Danielson proficiency.

Out-of-state applicants would be granted a 3-year provisional license at Tier 2. Since districts are concerned that they cannot attract a teacher at a Tier 1 level, TAC proposes that if a teacher has "x" number of years experience, they could come in at Tier 2, with directed professional development coursework as part of an IPLP.

Representative Horman asked how many other states have high stakes licensure. She would not want to disincentivize students and have them go out of state.

Jason Hancock provided a detailed explanation of the proposed Career Ladder and how it is calculated. (See attached).

Page 1: On average, 680 new teachers will enter the system each year. Statewide, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 instructional Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff is 15,520, which includes new teachers, certificated instructional staff, social workers, psychologists and counselors. On the chart, 7,300 have reached their maximum in years of experience, and 1,450 have reached their maximum in both experience and education.

Page 2 shows a projected support unit growth in FY 2015 of 1.2 percent. The FY15 minimum salary reimbursement grid shows a base salary of \$23,354, however, by a funded mandate, that figure is actually \$31,352.

Page 3 illustrates the fiscal impact in year 1b. The original estimate was \$42 million, however, because leadership premiums of \$850 per certified teacher were funded by the 2014 legislature, FY15 will require only \$23.7 million in additional funds.

The Salary Reimbursement Table illustrates how every teacher on the old grid will move to the new grid on the step closest to, but higher than, their previous placement. The FTE table indicates how many FTEs will be on each step, including Public Retirement System of Idaho (PERSI) and Federal Insurance Compensation Act (FICA). The “ghost steps” to the right gradually will be eliminated as full implementation is realized.

Page 4 shows a static analysis with nothing built in for growth; however, the steps are now moving and dynamic as some teachers move from Professional to Master level. The chart assumes that 25 percent of Professional teachers will qualify for Master status. The committee questioned if this model penalized “Standard” (Tier 1) teachers in years 4 and 5 if they did not yet qualify for Professional (Tier 2) status. Both Linda Clark and Wayne Freeman said that the intent was for Tier 1 teachers to continue to receive a raise in years 4 and 5, although not as great as if they reached Professional (Tier 1) licensure. Ms. Clark noted that in FY15, all new people on the Standard step would not actually move for 3 years. Jason replied that experienced teachers would be receiving significant increases. Senator Goedde noted that the highlighted figures on these charts were new money every year and were very significant.

Page 5 shows year 3 movement. On page 6 in year 4, those new teachers who began on rung 1 would be up \$5,000 per year as they advance into the Professional Tier. As a result, the increases for others are smaller in year 4. In year 5, the last ghost step is absorbed, the impact of year 4 is absorbed, and increases are again better for all.

Mr. Hancock said that some people have viewed this structure as a \$40K/\$50K/\$60K plan, but actually, it is a \$40, \$41 going to \$51K, and \$52K going to \$58K. Leadership premiums could add an additional \$2K per year. The final page 9 of Mr. Hancock’s presentations shows the assumptions he used.

Committee members raised questions about performance evaluations, cost of living adjustment, and district incentives to move people up in order to receive more funding. Linda Clark said that the Code needed to clearly state that the reimbursement grid was the minimum salary, and that districts do not have the option to pay less. Since the underlying purpose is fiscal stability, and the current system of teacher compensation contributes largely to instability, then the Code must guarantee that this is the minimum pay in order to identify, retain and recruit quality teachers. Superintendent Luna suggested that the SDE would also audit 10 percent of districts to determine if abuses were occurring. Rod Lewis cautioned that audits can be very subjective.

The committee agreed that student achievement would require more discussion. Superintendent Luna said that administrative rule, which has been in place for some time, requires that teacher evaluation be based one-third on student achievement and two-thirds on body of evidence, including the Danielson framework, input from teachers and students, and other evidences. Those measures continue regardless of what this committee does. In a tiered licensure model, student achievement is separate, and was adopted from the current rule as a definition. The work of this committee could supersede, fold into, upgrade or update the current requirements. The language is consistent with what is currently in place, but not with a percentage, such as one-third.

Rod Lewis asked how the State can have assurance that adequate student achievement levels are being realized by the districts, such as a framework that the districts consider in measuring student achievement. Christina Linder added that measures must have a research foundation. Linda Clark suggested other evaluation models for measuring a district's strategic plan, such as key performance indicators reading, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), standards against meeting or exceeding growth, PSAT, SAT, and increases in advanced opportunities. She suggested creating a dashboard that the state would provide for districts to use. Ms. Clark felt that if the State is standardizing licensure and compensation, then it should also have a standardized means for evaluation. She also questioned the role of End of Course (EOC) assessments for the subject that are not Idaho Core subjects.

Rod Lewis suggested that Superintendent Luna and Linda Clark lay out a framework on what the State should include for evaluating student achievement. He suggested that they think in terms of weight to be included. Ms. Clark said that they should choose a big range because the measures must be appropriate to each level; districts would mix and match, but some measures would be used by everyone. Senator Ward-Engelking said that one of the goals from the Task Force was to push decisions down to the local level – provide a list, but not mandate from the State level. Both Rod Lewis and Superintendent Luna cautioned that with so much additional money provided by the state, measureable student achievement will need to be a strong component of any plan.

Teachers in First Year With Current Employer

ExperienceYears	BA	BA+12	BA+24	MA / BA+36	MA+12 / BA+48	MA+24 / BA+60	MA+36 / ES/DR	
0	538.3228	17.5000	6.0000	99.6700	3.0000	7.4600	8.4980	680.4508
1	67.0100	0.0000	2.0000	18.5000	1.0300	0.4000	0.5700	89.5100
2	30.6300	2.5000	3.0000	17.6600	0.9100	0.6000	2.0000	57.3000
3	28.3600	6.5000	1.0000	14.3400	4.3000	3.0000	3.0000	60.5000
4	12.9600	5.7500	8.5000	12.5500	3.0000	0.0000	3.0000	45.7600
5	9.0700	10.5700	6.0000	24.5400	4.0000	7.3480	5.0000	66.5280
6	9.7200	3.3000	7.7100	17.8900	7.4000	3.0700	0.8000	49.8900
7	12.4800	3.0000	2.0000	12.3200	4.0000	2.9300	3.0000	39.7300
8	5.0000	2.3800	2.3400	11.9400	8.0000	7.2000	2.0000	38.8600
9	4.9400	2.9300	5.0000	5.9300	6.6000	3.0000	3.0000	31.4000
10	3.5000	6.9000	4.7500	12.2900	5.0000	0.0000	4.1200	36.5600
11	3.0000	2.0000	1.5000	7.0000	4.0000	5.9400	1.8000	25.2400
12	0.0000	1.2500	0.0000	7.7500	2.0000	6.0000	4.4000	21.4000
13	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	3.7200	4.1200	4.0000	1.0000	13.8400
14	3.0900	0.0000	0.0000	4.9700	3.5000	5.5000	1.0000	18.0600
15-99	5.7000	5.0000	7.6400	18.6800	16.9800	52.8400	33.6500	140.4900
								1,415.5188

FY14 Statewide

0	782.38	12.56	9.11	153.8	13.48	8.2	18.53	998.06
1	641.16	43.74	11.23	124.36	7.43	8.68	15.1	851.7
2	477.34	39.36	23.13	108.932	13.72	11.05	16.59	690.122
3	325.69	67.82	34.29	95.09	16.29	17.59	8.75	565.52
4	245.9	87.64	39.98	112.78	36.896	22.26	14.9	560.356
5	193.44	135.07	52.87	128.08	57.68	37.04	19.48	623.66
6	116.27	132.41	89.85	138.685	78.12	45.37	33.86	634.565
7	114.2	119.14632	90.02	120.95	86.59	71.47	39.43	641.80632
8	66.65	127.76	92.27	125.73	81.26	80.7	41.26	615.63
9	39.8	87.49	79.74	125.87	89.83	95.304	38.66	556.694
10	26.29	72.51	79.54	103.75	72.19	85.56	40.39	480.23
11	13.66	59.26	74.66	93.52	74.18	127.46	65.07	507.81
12	15.9	55.15	59.62	96.62	76.98	135.67	56.2	496.14
13	61.17	142.07	363.74	826.045	934.163	3521.304	1450.004	7298.496
	3119.85	1181.98632	1100.05	2354.212	1638.809	1507.569	1858.224	15520.78932

FY15 Projected Statewide

0	792.1068	12.7161	9.2233	155.7121	13.6476	8.3019	18.7604	1,010.4682
1	649.1311	44.2838	11.3696	125.9061	7.5224	8.7879	15.2877	862.2886
2	483.2744	39.8493	23.4176	110.2863	13.8906	11.1874	16.7963	698.7018
3	329.7391	68.6632	34.7163	96.2722	16.4925	17.8087	8.8588	572.5507
4	248.9571	88.7296	40.4770	114.1821	37.3547	22.5367	15.0852	567.3225
5	195.8449	136.7492	53.5273	129.6723	58.3971	37.5005	19.7222	631.4135
6	117.7155	134.0562	90.9670	140.4092	79.0912	45.9341	34.2810	642.4541
7	115.6198	120.6276	91.1392	122.4537	87.6665	72.3585	39.9202	649.7854
8	67.4786	129.3483	93.4171	127.2931	82.2702	81.7033	41.7730	623.2837
9	40.2948	88.5777	80.7314	127.4349	90.9468	96.4888	39.1406	563.6150
10	26.6168	73.4115	80.5289	105.0398	73.0875	86.6237	40.8921	486.2004
11	13.8298	59.9967	75.5882	94.6827	75.1022	129.0446	65.8790	514.1232
12	16.0977	55.8356	60.3612	97.8212	77.9370	137.3567	56.8987	502.3082
13	61.9305	143.8363	368.2621	836.3146	945.7768	3,565.0818	1,468.0309	7,389.2330
	3,158.6369	1,196.6811	1,113.7261	2,383.4802	1,659.1831	4,320.7147	1,881.3260	15,713.7482

FY15 Minimum Salary: \$31,750

	BA	BA + 12	BA + 24	MA BA + 36	MA + 12 BA + 48	MA + 24 BA + 60	MA + 36 PhD
0	\$23,354	\$24,230	\$25,138	\$26,081	\$27,059	\$28,074	\$29,127
1	\$24,230	\$25,138	\$26,081	\$27,059	\$28,074	\$29,127	\$30,219
2	\$25,138	\$26,081	\$27,059	\$28,074	\$29,127	\$30,219	\$31,352
3	\$26,081	\$27,059	\$28,074	\$29,127	\$30,219	\$31,352	\$32,528
4	\$27,059	\$28,074	\$29,127	\$30,219	\$31,352	\$32,528	\$33,748
5	\$28,074	\$29,127	\$30,219	\$31,352	\$32,528	\$33,748	\$35,013
6	\$29,127	\$30,219	\$31,352	\$32,528	\$33,748	\$35,013	\$36,326
7	\$30,219	\$31,352	\$32,528	\$33,748	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688
8	\$31,352	\$32,528	\$33,748	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$39,102
9	\$32,528	\$33,748	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$39,102	\$40,568
10	\$32,528	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$39,102	\$40,568	\$42,089
11	\$32,528	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$40,568	\$42,089	\$43,668
12	\$32,528	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$40,568	\$43,668	\$45,305
13+	\$32,528	\$35,013	\$36,326	\$37,688	\$40,568	\$43,668	\$47,004

Career Ladder Year 1b Impact

Fiscal Impact Table	FTE	Transition Cost
\$31,750	4,827.1094	\$7,178,515
\$32,528	609.4589	\$342,405
\$33,748	436.1255	\$130,983
\$35,013	694.4273	\$4,119,987
\$36,326	901.0850	\$3,938,518
\$37,688	1,346.4286	\$3,702,974
\$39,102	211.3493	\$225,891
\$40,568	1,224.5804	\$629,474
\$42,089	169.9368	\$184,134
\$43,668	3,768.3175	\$1,490,320
\$45,305	56.8987	\$47,039
\$47,004	1,468.0309	<u>\$1,739,443</u>
Additional Career Ladder Compensation:		\$23,729,683

Total FTE: 15,713.7482

Leadership Award Pool at \$850 per FTE: \$15,890,449

Total Year 1 Extra Cost: **\$39,620,132**

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$33,000	\$34,000	\$35,000						
Professional Teacher	\$40,000	\$41,000	\$42,000	\$43,000	\$44,000	\$45,000	\$46,000	\$47,000	\$48,000
Master Teacher	\$47,000	\$48,000	\$49,000	\$50,000	\$51,000				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	5,437	436	0						
Professional Teacher	3,153	1,225	0	170	3,768	0	57	0	1,468
Master Teacher	0	0	0	0	0				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$213,440,215	\$17,641,187	\$0						
Professional Teacher	\$150,058,774	\$59,732,214	\$0	\$8,693,472	\$197,259,363	\$0	\$3,113,849	\$0	\$83,832,783
Master Teacher	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				
	\$363,498,989	\$77,373,402	\$0	\$8,693,472	\$197,259,363	\$0	\$3,113,849	\$0	\$83,832,783

Career Ladder Cost: \$733,771,858
Leadership Award Pool at \$850 per FTE: \$15,890,449
Total System Cost: \$749,662,307

Career Ladder Year 2 Impact

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$34,250	\$35,250	\$36,250						
Professional Teacher	\$41,250	\$42,250	\$43,250	\$44,250	\$45,250	\$45,250	\$46,000	\$47,000	\$48,000
Master Teacher	\$48,250	\$49,250	\$50,250	\$51,250	\$52,250				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	680	5,201	417						
Professional Teacher	0	2,263	879	0	122	2,704	0	41	1,053
Master Teacher	2,354	0	0	0	0				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$27,726,482	\$218,120,202	\$17,994,151						
Professional Teacher	\$0	\$113,727,067	\$45,211,258	\$0	\$6,564,159	\$145,559,064	\$0	\$2,282,829	\$60,151,936
Master Teacher	\$135,111,053	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				
	\$162,837,535	\$331,847,269	\$63,205,409	\$0	\$6,564,159	\$145,559,064	\$0	\$2,282,829	\$60,151,936

Career Ladder Cost: \$772,448,201
Leadership Award Pool at \$1,000 per FTE: \$15,890,449
Total System Cost: \$788,338,651
Total System Cost Increase over Previous Year: \$38,676,343

Career Ladder Year 3 Impact

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$36,000	\$37,000	\$38,000						
Professional Teacher	\$43,000	\$44,000	\$45,000	\$46,000	\$47,000	\$47,000	\$47,000	\$47,000	\$48,000
Master Teacher	\$50,000	\$51,000	\$52,000	\$53,000	\$54,000				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	680	651	4,976						
Professional Teacher	299	0	2,165	841	0	117	2,587	0	1,047
Master Teacher	100	2,252	0	0	0				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$29,143,163	\$28,655,657	\$224,954,573						
Professional Teacher	\$15,315,371	\$0	\$115,884,166	\$46,003,701	\$0	\$6,522,782	\$144,641,524	\$0	\$59,777,626
Master Teacher	\$5,936,190	\$136,627,524	\$0	\$0	\$0				
	\$50,394,725	\$165,283,181	\$340,838,739	\$46,003,701	\$0	\$6,522,782	\$144,641,524	\$0	\$59,777,626

Career Ladder Cost: \$813,462,277
 Leadership Award Pool at \$1,000 per FTE: \$15,890,449
 Total System Cost: \$829,352,727
 Total System Cost Increase over Previous Year: \$41,014,076

Career Ladder Year 4 Impact

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$36,250	\$37,250	\$38,250						
Professional Teacher	\$43,250	\$44,250	\$45,250	\$46,250	\$47,250	\$47,250	\$47,250	\$47,250	\$48,000
Master Teacher	\$50,250	\$51,250	\$52,250	\$53,250	\$54,250				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	680	651	623						
Professional Teacher	3,570	286	0	2,071	804	0	112	2,475	1,001
Master Teacher	1,190	95	2,154	0	0				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$29,345,546	\$28,849,277	\$28,340,959						
Professional Teacher	\$183,710,113	\$15,078,107	\$0	\$113,945,658	\$45,207,575	\$0	\$6,273,519	\$139,114,181	\$57,189,082
Master Teacher	\$71,147,847	\$5,821,115	\$133,914,861	\$0	\$0				
	\$284,203,506	\$49,748,498	\$162,255,821	\$113,945,658	\$45,207,575	\$0	\$6,273,519	\$139,114,181	\$57,189,082

Career Ladder Cost: \$857,937,840
 Leadership Award Pool at \$1,000 per FTE: \$15,890,449
 Total System Cost: \$873,828,290
 Total System Cost Increase over Previous Year: \$44,475,563

Career Ladder Year 5 Impact

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$38,000	\$39,000	\$40,000						
Professional Teacher	\$45,000	\$46,000	\$47,000	\$48,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000	\$49,000
Master Teacher	\$52,000	\$53,000	\$54,000	\$55,000	\$56,000				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	680	651	623						
Professional Teacher	447	3,416	274	0	1,981	769	0	107	3,326
Master Teacher	149	1,139	91	2,061	0				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$30,762,228	\$30,204,612	\$29,637,605						
Professional Teacher	\$23,923,865	\$186,930,102	\$15,321,661	\$0	\$115,493,245	\$44,851,806	\$0	\$6,224,149	\$193,871,873
Master Teacher	\$9,215,118	\$71,791,996	\$5,867,870	\$134,858,905	\$0				
	\$63,901,212	\$288,926,709	\$50,827,136	\$134,858,905	\$115,493,245	\$44,851,806	\$0	\$6,224,149	\$193,871,873

Career Ladder Cost: \$898,955,036
 Leadership Award Pool at \$1,000 per FTE: \$15,890,449
 Total System Cost: \$914,845,485
 Total System Cost Increase over Previous Year: \$41,017,196

Career Ladder Year 6 Impact

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$40,000	\$41,000	\$42,000						
Professional Teacher	\$47,000	\$48,000	\$49,000	\$50,000	\$51,000	\$51,000	\$51,000	\$51,000	\$51,000
Master Teacher	\$54,000	\$55,000	\$56,000	\$57,000	\$58,000				

FTE Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	680	651	623						
Professional Teacher	447	428	3,268	262	0	1,895	736	0	3,284
Master Teacher	149	143	1,089	87	1,972				

Salary Reimbursement Table

Career Ladder Rung	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step	Ghost Step
Standard Teacher	\$32,381,293	\$31,753,566	\$31,119,485						
Professional Teacher	\$24,987,148	\$24,413,752	\$190,498,671	\$15,593,818	\$0	\$115,001,933	\$44,661,005	\$0	\$199,244,807
Master Teacher	\$9,569,546	\$9,324,697	\$72,570,922	\$5,925,651	\$136,056,531				
	\$66,937,987	\$65,492,015	\$294,189,079	\$21,519,469	\$136,056,531	\$115,001,933	\$44,661,005	\$0	\$199,244,807

Career Ladder Cost: \$943,102,825
 Leadership Award Pool at \$1,000 per FTE: \$15,890,449
 Total System Cost: \$958,993,274
 Total System Cost Increase over Previous Year: \$44,147,789

Average Cost per year over 6 years: \$41,491,850

Assumptions

1. All teachers will be moved to Career Ladder in Year 1
2. In Year 1, each teacher will be placed on a Rung and Step next above the level of salary reimbursement their district would receive under the current (FY14) grid
3. After Year 1, those on Career Ladder will progress one step per year
4. For a Career Ladder teacher to move from Rung 1 to Rung 2, the teacher must have spent at least one year on Rung 1, Step 3, and hold professional licensure
5. For a Career Ladder teacher to move from Rung 2 to Rung 3, the teacher must have at least 3 years experience and hold master licensure
6. Beginning in Year 2, all new hires with at least 1 year experience will be placed on at least Rung 1, Step 2
7. Beginning in Year 3, all new hires with at least 2 years experience will be placed on at least Rung 1, Step 3
8. Beginning in Year 4, all new hires with at least 3 years experience will be placed on at least Rung 2, Step 1, provided they have attained professional licensure
9. Beginning in Year 5, all new hires with at least 4 years experience will be placed on at least Rung 2, Step 2, provided they have attained professional licensure (etc.)
10. Assumed annual average net retention rate: 95.67% (does not count replacing a lost experienced teacher with a new experienced teacher as attrition)
11. Value of Step increments: \$1,000
12. Value of Rung increments: \$7,000
13. % of teachers with 5+ years of experience qualifying for master licensure 25%
14. If a teacher moves backwards in terms of their licensure status, then they are moved back to the terminal step in the previous rung